Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0497/14

Site: 21 Mill Lane

Proposal: Two storey rear extension and single storey side extensions (Re-submission of AWDM/0017/14)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a two-storey rear extension and single storey side extensions, to measure in its entirety 8.2 metres in height, 10.5 metres in length, and 11 metres in width.

The site is a detached two-storey private dwellinghouse. Its first floor is contained in steeply pitched, almost vertical sloped roof, with low flanking eaves. The building walls are rendered. A single storey rear flat roof extension has been built off its original back wall.

The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb of Shoreham.

Relevant site history
AWDM/0017/14
Two storey rear extension and single storey side extensions
Withdrawn

Consultations
None

Representations
Objection from occupier of No. 23 Mill Lane, content summarised below:-
Rights to Light. The roof line of the first floor extension still breaches the BRE 25 degree vertical test from our kitchen window, plus received current level of light into our kitchen for over 20 years. Would appear applicant not conducted a BRE light test as requested by our Rights to Light Surveyor, Shirley Ellis in her letter dated 31 January 2014. Although the applicant has in fairness reduced the impact of their proposal we still consider the first floor extension will reduce the light level to our kitchen and request the BRE light test is carried out. Party Wall. In accordance with the Party Wall Act, we would request 2 months notice from the applicant, detailing the foundation and construction proposals plus the external wall and roof finishes of the single storey side extension wall which will abut the retaining wall between our properties. Velux windows. To maintain our privacy the planned Velux roof lights for the new bathroom and bedroom 1 on the north elevation we would request are fitted with opaque glass.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adur District Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The extension is large, and would add considerable bulk to the host building.

However the majority of the extension is massed at the rear of the property, not being visible from public vantage point. The first floor element of this part of the extension follows the pitch of the building's existing roof, matching the building's ridge and eaves. This ensures its overall scale would not be out of proportion with the host building.

The extension would be built of exterior materials and finishes that would match the main house, which would help it blend in. The extension fenestration and new roof lights would also match that on the existing property.

The sides of the extension would be visible from the public street. However these are of a modest scale being single storey and flat roof along most of their length. The false pitch roofs to both sides would visually tie in these extensions to the rest of the building.

For all these reasons, insufficient visual harm would arise from this proposal.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours to either side who would be principally impacted upon by this development (which is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to north (No. 23)

This neighbour has objected to the proposal. Their own building has a ground floor window facing onto the application site. This serves as the sole means of light to the kitchen, which is linked through to a glazed lean-to structure at the rear.

It is inevitable the extension would reduce the daylight and sunlight received by this neighbour's kitchen, and curtail outlook from it. However the test for withholding planning permission is based on the severity of such impacts. For the following reasons in this case, those impacts would not be unacceptable in their nature meaning adverse overbearing and overshadowing effect would be avoided.

The outlook and light received by the kitchen side window is already compromised by the existing building form of No. 21. Its length extends to just under half of the total kitchen window. Close boarded fencing atop a brick wall has also taken away light and outlook. Had it been demonstrated the relevant

BRE light test could well have failed even when applied to the existing circumstance (there is no requirement on the applicant to undertake the test).

Although the extension would take further light and outlook away from the kitchen, the use and activity of this space reflects the reality of its compromised light and outlook; at the time of the site visit it was not evidently laid out by the owner as their main dining area, with this activity mostly focused on the living space at the rear.

Turning to the rest of the habitable space, the glazed lean-to is not primary living space and the living space at the rear would be unaffected by the proposal by way of overbearing and overshadowing.

There would be some distance between the first floor element of the extension and neighbouring building and the side element is single storey and flat roof, which would help reduce impact.

The position and angle of the new lights in the side roof slope avoids direct overlooking, although it would be advisable to obscure these to maintain privacy. Views from the first floor fenestration in the rear of the extension would be oblique onto the neighbour – so unacceptable loss of privacy and overlooking would be avoided.

Neighbour to south (No. 19)

This neighbouring building has itself been extended by way of a single storey extensions built off its side, protruding beyond its rear wall.

The proposed extension would impact on this neighbour as it would overbear and overshadow to a certain extent.

However, the existing side extensions have themselves reduced the outlook and light to the rear fenestration of this neighbouring building and the additional overbearing resulting from the proposal would not be of harmful severity; the proposed extension would protrude only marginally forward of these and the bulk of the first floor element would be positioned over the roofs of these extensions, so reducing the impact onto fenestration at the rear.

The flat roof of the side element of the extension and distance of the first floor element from the shared boundary would also help reduce overbearing impact.

The position and angle of the new lights in the side roof slope avoids direct overlooking, although it would be advisable to obscure these to maintain privacy. Views from the first floor fenestration in the rear of the extension would be oblique onto the neighbour – so unacceptable loss of privacy and overlooking would be avoided.

It is noted this neighbour has not objected to the proposal.

Recommendation

Approve

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match
4. Notwithstanding “pd” no windows/openings in side elevations
5. Roof lights be obscured

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 9-06-2014

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 9 June 2014